
Appeals Received South Sunderland

Between 01/12/2010 and 31/12/2010

Ref No	Address	Description	Date Appeal Lodged
10/00038/REF	Beechcroft 29 Thornholme Road Sunderland SR2 7LZ	Change of use from residential care home to a 14-bedroomed house in multiple occupation (AMENDED DESCRIPTION 12.10.2010)	21/12/2010
10/00036/REF	23 And 23 And A Half Fawcett Street Sunderland SR1 1RH	Installation of new shop fronts.	08/12/2010

Appeals Determined Sunderland South

Between 01/12/2010 and 31/12/2010

TEAM	Ref No	ADDRESS	Description	Decision	Date of Decision
	10/00027/REF	Footpath At Fordfield Road Sunderland	Installation of a 12.5 metre high street pole supporting 3no. Vodafone antennas and 3no O2 antennas, ground based equipment cabinet and ancillary development. (Cell ID 64496).	DISMIS	24/12/2010



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2010

by **John L Gray DipArch MSc Registered Architect**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 December 2010

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
RECEIVED

24 DEC 2010

SUNDERLAND CITY COUNCIL

Appeal Ref. APP/J4525/A/10/2135436

Footway at Fordfield Drive, South Hylton, Sunderland

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under a development order.
- The appeal is made by Vodaphone UK Limited against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
- The application, ref. 10/01377/TEX, dated 15 April 2010, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2010.
- The development proposed is the erection of a 12.5m high monopole supporting three Vodaphone and three O₂ antennas together with two ground-based equipment cabinets.

Decision: I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

1. At present, the location for the proposed pole is very open. There is two-storey housing on the north side of Fordfield Road, around 50m to the west, and on the south side, to both west and east. Directly opposite is a vacant site on which planning permission has been granted for a care home. And the vast open area of land to the north and east should become developed for housing as part of the High Ford Renewal Area, with the land immediately north of the location allocated for community facilities.
2. Fordfield Road is straight and fairly open, the housing on both sides being set behind front gardens. It seems to me unlikely that whatever development takes place would be so much closer to the road as radically to change the character of the street scene. The existing lighting columns are annotated on the application plans as 8.0m high and, being a similar height to the ridges of the housing, accentuate the straight line of the road. There is a pole-mounted CCTV camera nearby, also of a similar height, and occasional telegraph poles about 6.0m high. The location for the proposed pole is more or less at the top of a hill so there would be long views of it against the skyline from both east and west. The pole would be over 4.0m higher than the street lighting and that additional height represents roughly the height of the shroud for the six antennas, which would be around 450mm in diameter, much wider than the pole itself.
3. In my judgement, the substantial height and bulk of the antenna shroud would render the proposed monopole unduly prominent and incongruous in the street scene, putting it in conflict with saved UDP Policies B2 and, more particularly, B26. The associated cabinets within the footway would exacerbate that impact from close-to. I have given careful consideration to the information supporting the application, the grounds of appeal and the guidance in PPG8 (Planning Policy Guidance Note 8: Telecommunications) but have found nothing which

could outweigh my conclusion on the harmful impact from the proposed siting and design of the monopole. Accordingly, I shall dismiss the appeal.

4. The likely development of the open land to the north and north-east of the proposed location has no material influence on my conclusion above. I do wonder, however, whether there would be the opportunity to include a monopole within that development in a way that overcame the objection I have found to the proposed location.

John L. Gray

Inspector